

## REMARKS

The Office Action appears to contain the following errors.

### In The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action asserts that “[i]n independent claims 31, 1, 15, 17, 45 and 61-66, the phrase ‘receiving an approval service’ and ‘storing the approval service’ are vague”. (Office Action, page 2). However, Claim 17, 62, 64, 65 and 66 do not recite the phrase “receiving an approval service” or the phrase “storing the approval service”.

### In The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action indicates that Claims 19 to 25 and 49 to 55 are rejected over *Jemella*. (See, paragraph 5 of Office Action, page 3). However, the Office Action provides no reasoning for the rejections of these claims.

In entering the rejections of Claims 36 to 46, the Office Action asserts that these claims “have similar limitations as in claim 31-35” and are “rejected for the same reasons”. (Office Action, page 5). However, Claims 36 to 46 clearly include different features than Claims 31 to 35. As such, Applicants fail to see how Claims 36 to 46 could be rejected “for the same reasons” as Claims 31 to 35.

Similarly, the Office Action asserts that Claim 47 “has similar limitation as in claim 31” and is “rejected over the same reason set forth in claim 31”. (Office Action, page 5). However, Claim 47 clearly includes different features than Claim 31. Therefore, Applicants fail to see how Claim 47 could be rejected “over the same reason” as Claim 31.

Likewise, the Office Action asserts that Claims 6 to 18 and 26 to 30 “are rejected for the same reasons set forth in system claims 1-5 above because the [sic, they] are merely the system to carry out method claims 36-48, 56-60.” (Office Action, page

6)(emphasis added). In this view, these rejections appear to suffer from the same problems noted above, at least with regard to the rejections of Claims 36 to 47.

Finally, the Office Action enters rejections of Claims 62, 63 and 64 because they “carry out the method claims 36, 45, 47 . . .” (Office Action, page 6). Consequently, the rejections of Claims 62, 63 and 64 appear to suffer from the same problems noted above with regard to Claims 36, 45 and 47.

#### Conclusion

As this request is being filed within one month from the mailing date of the Office Action. Applicants request that the previously set period for reply is restarted to run from the mailing date of the corrected Office Action. (See, MPEP § 710.06).

FORMAL MATTER

Turning to a formal matter, Applicants respectfully request that the corrected Office Action include an initialed Form PTO-1449 indicating that the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated May 2, 2002 have been considered. This is a second request.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory S. Weaver, #53,751/  
Gregory S. Weaver  
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200